Structural evolution of galaxies since cosmic noon





Charlotte Avery, Natascha Förster Schreiber, Kay Guo, Shardha Jogee, Amit Nestor, Pascal Oesch, Sedona Price, Raman Sharma, Kenichi Tadaki, Jun Toshikawa, Junkai Zhang KMOS3D, 3D-DASH, CEERS, FRESCO teams



Stijn Wuyts

ESAC, October 2022







Förster Schreiber & Wuyts 2020, ARAA

Intrinsic 3D shapes - quiescent galaxies



Zhang,SW+2022 KiDS+VIKING+HSC-SSP (500,000 quiescent galaxies at 0<z<0.9) also van der Wel+2009; Holden+2012; Satoh+2019





Intrinsic 3D shapes - star-forming galaxies





Elongated shapes at low-M & high-z Disky shapes at intermediate M

Zhang+2019 CANDELS

Dec

also Elmegreen+2005; Law+2012; van der Wel+2014

Rounder shapes at log(M) > 11 & low-z Zhang+in prep **HSC + 3D-DASH**







log(M ∗ [M _☉])

Attenuation vs projected axial ratio \bigstar median A_V for (M_{star}, z) bin

- @fixed M: stronger $A_V q$ relation at lower redshift
- Typical A_V increases with increasing M
- @fixed M: typical A_V varies only modestly with z

Zhang+in prep CANDELS, 3D-DASH, KIDS + VIKING + HSC-SSP also Patel+2012; Zuckerman+2021; Shapley+2022





log(M ∗ [M _☉])



log(M ∗ [M _☉])



log(M ∗ [M _☉])



12.0



log(M∗ [M_☉])





log(M ∗ [M _☉])









ent attenuation

ttenuation vs projected axial ratio r median A_v for (M_{star}, z) bin 11 Tacconi+2020 (FIR observations) SKIRT attenuation modelling 10 9 log(M_{dust} 8 6 Inconsistency attenuation vs FIR results → shortcoming of assumed star-dust geometry 5 + 9.0 9.5 10.0 10.5 11.0 12.0 11.5 $log(M_{star})$ Zhang+in prep CANDELS, 3D-DASH, KiDS + VIKING + HSC-SSP

also Patel+2012; Zuckerman+2021; Shapley+2022

20



Outlook: FRESCO JWST/NIRCam



PI P.Oesch FRESCO JWST/NIRCam grism

Dust-insensitive SFR tracers at cosmic noon



log(M ∗ [M _☉])





og(M∗ [M_☉])























Intrinsic 3D shapes - star-forming galaxies

Elongated Spheroidal Disky



Förster Schreiber & Wuyts 2020

Stellar Mass (M_{\odot})

also Elmegreen+2005; Law+2012; van der Wel+2014

Wisnioski+2019; also Kassin+2012; Simons+2017; Turner+2017; Tiley+2021



Baryon dominance within R_e for high Σ_{bar} disks



Nestor+2022; also Wuyts+2016; Genzel+2017,2022; Lang+2017; Mendel+2020; Price+2021 (see Bouché+2022 for cores in low-M, DM-dominated galaxies at z~1) Theory: Lovell+2018; Dekel+2021; Übler+2021 Further observational perspectives: Tiley+2019; Sharma+2021; Lelli+2021



Baryon dominance within R_e for high Σ_{bar} disks



Nestor+2022; also Wuyts+2016; Genzel+2017,2022; Lang+2017; Mendel+2020; Price+2021 (see Bouché+2022 for cores in low-M, DM-dominated galaxies at z~1) Theory: Lovell+2018; Dekel+2021; Übler+2021 Further observational perspectives: Tiley+2019; Sharma+2021; Lelli+2021



JWST: rest-NIR reveals an early onset of bar formation

F160W HST









Kinematic residual maps — signatures of non-circular motions



Price+2021







 $(\Delta V)_{med} = -13.2$







Conclusions

Quiescent galaxies Intrinsic 3D shapes





Shapes ~ merger histories

Round in 3D @ log(M) > 11and/or when $n \ge 4$, yet more in overdensities

These trends hold for z=0-1 z~2 QGs more disky!

Clumpier dust geometries at high z

Needed to reconcile inclinationdependent attenuation with constraints on M_{dust} from FIR scaling relations.

Based on RT accounting for projected axis ratios, sizes and n_{Sersic} of SFGs

Star-forming galaxies Star & dust geometries

Star-forming galaxies In-situ evolution



In-situ evolution

Disk settling = $f(M_{star}, z)$

f_{DM}(<R_e) ∽ as Σ_{bar} ↗

⇒ baryons efficiently condense to centre, whereas inner DM profile cored Kinematic signatures of radial inflow Rest-NIR morphologies: bars up to z ~ 2







